

Teresa M. Corbin (SBN 132360)  
Denise M. De Mory (SBN 168076)  
Jaclyn C. Fink (SBN 217913)  
**HOWREY LLP**  
525 Market Street, Suite 3600  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 848-4900  
Facsimile: (415) 848-4999

Attorneys for Plaintiff SYNOPSYS, INC.  
and for Defendants AEROFLEX INCORPORATED  
AMI SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX  
ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS, LTD., MATROX  
GRAPHICS, INC., MATROX INTERNATIONAL  
CORP., MATROX TECH, INC., and  
AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, AMI SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS LTD., MATROX GRAPHICS INC., MATROX INTERNATIONAL CORP., MATROX TECH, INC., AND AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC.

## Defendants.

---

SYNOPSYS, INC.

**Plaintiff,**

VS.

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

## Defendant.

Case No. C03-4669 MJJ (EMC)

Case No. C03-2289 MJJ (EMC)

# **GUIDE TO SYNOPSYS' AND CUSTOMER DEFENDANTS' SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTIONS**

Date: September 26, 2006  
Time: 9:30 a.m.  
Courtroom: 11, 19th Floor  
Judge: Martin J. Jenkins

1       It is well past time for Ricoh's baseless case to be dismissed. To that end, Synopsys and/or the  
 2 Customer Defendants have filed with this Court nine summary judgment motions. Filing such an  
 3 overwhelming number of summary judgment motions has been done reluctantly, given the amount of  
 4 resources required both on the part of the Court and counsel, but it is necessary in order to prevent an  
 5 even greater and unneeded expenditure of resources for a trial on this meritless case. Indeed, many  
 6 more summary judgment motions on many more issues could be filed, but the issues presented in these  
 7 motions are most appropriate for summary judgment at this point in the case.

8       The issues presented in the majority of the motions are case dispositive. To lessen the burden  
 9 on the Court, Synopsys and the Customer Defendants suggest that these dispositive motions should be  
 10 considered by the Court in the following order. Should the Court find noninfringement based on  
 11 Motion No. 1 or 2, it need not consider Motion No. 3; similarly, should the Court find invalidity  
 12 through Motion No. 3, it need not consider Motion No. 4:

- 13       1.      Noninfringement based upon the definition of RTL (Dkt. Nos. 568 & 422).<sup>1</sup>
- 14       2.      Noninfringement based upon the definition of Hardware Cells (Dkt. Nos. 424 & 570).
- 15       3.      Invalidity/dismissal based upon the joint inventorship of Dr. Foo (Dkt. Nos. 415 &  
 16 553).
- 17       4.      Invalidity based upon Kowalski/VDAA references (Dkt. Nos. 421 & 572).
- 18       5.      Unenforceability based upon inequitable conduct (Dkt. Nos. 419 & 565).
- 19       6.      Noninfringement based upon various arguments (Dkt. Nos. 425 & 571).

20       Although Synopsys and the Customer Defendants are confident that the Court will find one of  
 21 these motions (if not all of them) to be sufficient to dispose of this case, in the unlikely event the Court  
 22 denies *all* of the above motions, there are three non-dispositive motions filed in the *Ricoh* case that the  
 23 Court should consider:

- 24       7.      Proper measure of damages (Dkt. No. 554).
- 25       8.      Laches (Dkt. No. 556).

---

27       1 The docket number in the *Synopsys* case (03-2289) is listed first; the number in the *Ricoh* case (03-4669) is listed second.  
 28

1           9.       Nonwillfulness (Dkt. No. 552).

2 The non-dispositive motions all deal with the measure of damages potentially available to Ricoh.  
3 Should Ricoh's case survive the dispositive motions, a ruling on these three non-dispositive motions  
4 would likely facilitate the settlement of the case, as it would give the parties guidance on the potential  
5 value of this case.

6           Synopsys and the Customer Defendants respectfully suggest that above is the most efficient  
7 way for the Court to tackle the issues raised in the various motions, and they appreciate the Court's  
8 consideration of this proposal.

9  
10 Dated: August 18, 2006

HOWREY LLP

11  
12 By:           /s/ Denise M. De Mory \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Denise M. De Mory  
14 Attorney for Plaintiff SYNOPSYS, INC.  
15 and Defendants AEROFLEX  
16 INCORPORATED, AMI  
17 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX  
18 ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS, LTD.,  
19 MATROX GRAPHICS INC., MATROX  
20 INTERNATIONAL CORP., MATROX  
21 TECH, INC., and AEROFLEX  
22 COLORADO SPRINGS, INC.